arXiv:1107.3216v1 [math.DS] 16 Jul 2011

CHARACTERIZATION OF HYPERBOLICITY AND GENERALIZED SHADOWING LEMMA

DAVOR DRAGIČEVIĆ AND SINIŠA SLIJEPČEVIĆ

Abstract. J. Mather characterized uniform hyperbolicity of a discrete dynamical system as equivalent to invertibility of an operator on the set of all sequences bounded in norm in the tangent bundle of an orbit. We develop a similar characterization of nonuniform hyperbolicity and show that it is equivalent to invertibility of the same operator on a larger, Fréchet space. We apply it to obtain a condition for a diffeomorphism on the boundary of the set of Anosov diffeomorphisms to be nonuniformly hyperbolic. Finally we generalise the Shadowing lemma in the same context.

1. Introduction

Assume f is a C^1diffeomorphism on a finite dimensional Riemannian smooth manifold M. Recall that a compact f-invariant set $\Lambda \subseteq M$ is uniformly hyperbolic if for each $x \in \Lambda$ there exist a decomposition $T_xM = E^s(x) \oplus E^u(x)$ and constants $c > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$, such that for each $x \in \Lambda$, $Df(x)E^s(x) = E^s(f(x))$ and $Df(x)E^u(x) = E^u(f(x))$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Df^k(x)\eta| &\leq c\lambda^k|\eta| \text{ whenever } \eta \in E^s(x) \text{ and } k > 0, \text{and} \\ |Df^{-k}(x)\eta| &\leq c\lambda^k|\eta| \text{ whenever } \eta \in E^u(x) \text{ and } k > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that a f-invariant set Λ is (nonuniformly) hyperbolic, if each point of Λ has non-zero Lyapunov exponents. An ergodic measure μ is hyperbolic, if μ-a.e. point has non-zero Lyapunov exponents ([1], [2]). Definitions are recalled in more detail in Section 3.

We study here different characterizations of uniform and nonuniform hyperbolicity, inspired by a characterization of J. Mather ([8], [9]), closely related to a concept referred to in the physics literature as Thouless formula ([13]). We first introduce the notation. We will always assume $M = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ is a d dimensional torus with the canonical Riemannian metric, for simplicity of notation and clarity of arguments. All results are valid for arbitrary finite dimensional smooth Riemannian manifolds, and can be easily generalized by choosing appropriate local charts. The set $M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ will be the set of all sequences $\boldsymbol{x}= (x_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $x_k \in M$. A tangent space T_xM will be naturally identified with $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the space $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ contains the subset of all tangent orbits $\eta_{n+1} = Df(x_n)\eta_n$.

Assume $X_\infty = l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the Banach space of sequences $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $\eta_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\eta_k| < \infty$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $||.||_\infty$

Date: June 17, 2011.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37D20, 37D25.

Key words and phrases. Hyperbolicity, Lyapunov exponents, shadowing, Anosov maps.

is the sup norm on X_∞. For any $\mathbf{x} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (not necessarily an orbit) we define the operator $\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}} \colon X_\infty \to X_\infty$ by:

$$(\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}}\boldsymbol{\eta})_k = \eta_k - Df(x_{k-1})\eta_{k-1},\ k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1}$$

It is easy to check that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a well defined, bounded linear operator on X_∞.

We will denote by $o(x) \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the orbit of $x \in M$. The operator $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ measures how much $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ differs from a tangent orbit. Assume $\Lambda \in M$ is a closed invariant set. J. Mather proved the following characterization of uniform hyperbolicity: Λ is uniformly hyperbolic if and only if for each $x \in \Lambda$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse with the norm uniformly bounded in Λ. Mather's characterization is actually in terms of operators on sections of the tangent bundle ([4], [9]). Here we use the equivalent setting from [8].

We consider this characterization of uniform hyperbolicity to be particularly elegant and inspiring. For example, one can relatively easily obtain all classical results of the theory of uniform hyperbolicity such as shadowing, existence of stable and unstable manifolds and structural stability, by an appropriate application of inverse or implicit function theorems on Banach spaces, using the operator $\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}}$ ([8], [9], [10]).

We will need here a more general family of norms $||.||_n$, $1 \leq n \leq \infty$, on subsets of $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, defined as

$$||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_n = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp(-|k|/n)|\eta_k|. \tag{2}$$

Let X_n be the set of all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_n < \infty$. We will also continue to write X_∞ instead of the usual notation $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. As M is compact, it is easy to check that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a well-defined, bounded linear operator on X_n for any positive integer n and any $\mathbf{x} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

We will first somewhat extend the Mather's characterization of uniform hyperbolicity to norms $||.||_n$ in order to put the later results in the right context.

Theorem 1. *Assume f is a diffeomorphism on M and $\Lambda \subseteq M$ is a closed invariant set. Then Λ is uniformly hyperbolic if and only if for some n_0, $1 \leq n_0 \leq \infty$ and for each $x \in \Lambda$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse in X_{n_0} such that $||\Gamma^{-1}_{o(x)}||_{n_0}$ is bounded uniformly in Λ.*

Furthermore, if this holds for some n_0, then it holds for all sufficiently large n.

This is discussed and proved in Section 2.

Now let $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$ be the Fréchet space of sequences in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ growing subexpontentially in norm. We then show that we can use the same language and characterize nonuniform hyperbolicity, and prove the following in Section 3:

Theorem 2. *Assume f is a diffeomorphism on M, and μ an ergodic measure. Then μ is (nonuniformly) hyperbolic if and only if for μ-a.e. $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse in $\mathcal{N}$.*

We discuss in the same section in some detail the structure of the space $\mathcal{N}$ with respect to the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$, and develop further characterizations of nonuniform hyperbolicity more suitable to applications.

As an application, we investigate in Section 4 limits of sequences of Anosov diffeomorphisms. We show that if uniform hyperbolicity of Anosov diffeomorphisms is destroyed on a set A of measure 0 in such a way that the speed of divergence of uniform bounds is not exponentially fast with respect to the size of neighborhoods of

A, then the limit is a nonuniformly hyperbolic map. This application suggests that our characterization may provide new insights, as the proof is analytical (including relatively strong tools such as the Open mapping theorem for Fréchet spaces) and ergodic-theoretical, but requires no geometric information which is typically required in invariant cone and similar techniques.

One of the key topological properties of uniformly and nonuniformly hyperbolic sets is that one can prove a version of shadowing lemma, and as a corollary that there are infinitely many periodic orbits. We can say that an invariant set or measure μ is *shadowable*, if such a shadowing lemma holds (a more precise definition is in Section 5).

We finally show that something less than hyperbolicity is required to obtain the shadowing property, and can be expressed as follows:

Theorem 3. *Let f be a $C^{1+\alpha}$ diffeomorphism on M, and Λ an invariant set. Assume that there is some n, $1 \leq n \leq \infty$, such that for all $x \in \Lambda$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse in X_n. Then Λ is shadowable.*

We prove it in Section 5, and also explain in which sense it generalizes the Shadowing lemmas in uniformly and nonuniformly hyperbolic cases.

We now suggest various applications of that result. First, the shadowing of the type described in Theorem 3 may hold in many dynamical systems, such as twist and symplectic maps and more general Hamiltonian systems. They often have rich regions of hyperbolic-like behavior with shadowing phenomena, but nonuniform hyperbolicity on a set of positive measure has not been proved and remains in many cases a conjecture. Furthermore, it can be used in analysis of infinitely dimensional dynamical systems, where it is difficult to use classical definitions of uniform and nonuniform hyperbolicity. Finally, one may try to apply it for further investigation of relationship of shadowing and stochastic stability ([3], Problem D10).

2. Uniform hyperbolicity

In this section f is a C^1 diffeomorphism on M. We introduce a family of norms on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ more general than the norms X_n, $1 \leq n \leq \infty$. Let $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $w_k > 0$ and such that for some $b > 0$,

$$\sup_{k\in\boldsymbol{Z}} \frac{w_{k-1}}{w_k} < b, \ \sup_{k\in\boldsymbol{Z}} \frac{w_k}{w_{k-1}} < b. \tag{3}$$

Assume N is a norm defined as

$$N(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \sup_{k\in\boldsymbol{Z}} w_k |\eta_k|,$$

and let $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ be the set of all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $N(\boldsymbol{\eta}) < \infty$. If Υ is a linear operator on $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ which can be represented as a matrix $\Upsilon = (\Upsilon_{i,j})$, $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\Upsilon_{i,j}$ is a linear operator on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the norm $N(\Upsilon)$ can be bounded with

$$N(\Upsilon) \leq \sup_{i\in\boldsymbol{Z}} w_i \sum_{j\in\boldsymbol{Z}} \frac{1}{w_j} |\Upsilon_{i,j}|. \tag{4}$$

(The results such as (4) on operators with representations as infinite matrices are summarized in Section 6: Appendix). Recall the definition of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ in Section 1, and that we assume that $M = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$, hence compact. It is easy to check that (3), (4) imply that if $x \in M$, then $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is a bounded linear operator on $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$.

First note that for a uniformly hyperbolic set Λ, the angle between $E^s(x)$ and $E^u(x)$ is uniformly bounded away from zero (e.g. [7], Corollary 6.4.5). Therefore there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that, if $\eta = \eta^s + \eta^u$ is the hyperbolic splitting of $\eta \in T_xM$, then

$$|\eta^s| \leq a|\eta|, |\eta^u| \leq a|\eta|. \tag{5}$$

Similarly, if $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}^s + \boldsymbol{\eta}^u$ is the hyperbolic splitting in each component along some sequence in Λ, then

$$N(\boldsymbol{\eta}^s) \leq aN(\boldsymbol{\eta}),\ N(\boldsymbol{\eta}^u) \leq aN(\boldsymbol{\eta}). \tag{6}$$

Proposition 1. *Let $\Lambda \subset M$ be a closed invariant uniformly hyperbolic set. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any norm N satisfying (3) with $1 \leqslant b \leqslant 1+\delta$, the following holds: for all $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible in $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ and $N(\Gamma_{o(x)}^{-1})$ is uniformly bounded in Λ.*

Proof. Let $c > 0$, $\lambda < 1$ be as in the definition of uniformly hyperbolic set. Take any $\delta > 0$ such that $\lambda(1+\delta) < 1$ and choose any $x \in \Lambda$. Since (3) holds and $b \leqslant 1+\delta$ as assumed, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $l \geqslant 0$

$$\frac{w_k}{w_{k-l}} \leqslant (1+\delta)^l,\ \frac{w_k}{w_{k+l}} \leqslant (1+\delta)^l. \tag{7}$$

Injectivity of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ on $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. Assume that $\Gamma_{o(x)}\boldsymbol{\eta} = 0$ for some $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we can write $\eta_k = \eta_k^s + \eta_k^u$, where $\eta_k^s \in E^s(x_k)$ and $\eta_k^u \in E^u(x_k)$. Definition of uniform hyperbolicity then implies that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\eta_k^s = Df(x_{k-1})\eta_{k-1}^s$ and $\eta_k^u = Df(x_{k-1})\eta_{k-1}^u$. Assume now $\eta_j^s \neq 0$ for some integer j. Then for all $l \geqslant 0$,

$$|\eta_j^s| = |Df^l(x_{j-l})\eta_{j-l}^s| \leqslant c\lambda^l|\eta_{j-l}^s|. \tag{8}$$

Combining inequalities (7) and (8) we conclude that for all $l \geqslant 0$

$$w_{j-l}|\eta_{j-l}^s| \geqslant \frac{1}{c(\lambda(1+\delta))^l}w_j|\eta_j^s|. \tag{9}$$

As $\lambda(1+\delta) < 1$, we get from (9) that $w_{j-l}|\eta_{j-l}^s|$ diverges to ∞ as $l \to \infty$, hence $\boldsymbol{\eta}^s \notin X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$, which is in contradiction with (6). Similarly we get that $\eta_j^u = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, therefore $\boldsymbol{\eta} = 0$.

Surjectivity of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ on $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. For each integer k we define

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_k^s &= \sum_{l\geq 0} Df^l(x_{k-l})\eta_{k-l}^s, \\ \xi_k^u &= -\sum_{l\geq 1} Df^{-l}(x_{k+l})\eta_{k+l}^u. \end{aligned}$$

Now using (7) and the definition of N we get

$$\begin{aligned} w_k|\xi_k^s| &\leqslant \sum_{l\geq 0} w_k c\lambda^l|\eta_{k-l}^s| = \sum_{l\geq 0}\frac{w_k}{w_{k-l}}c\lambda^l w_{k-l}|\eta_{k-l}^s| \\ &\leqslant \sum_{l\geqslant 0} c(\lambda(1+\delta))^l w_{k-l}|\eta_{k-l}^s| \leqslant \frac{c}{1-\lambda(1+\delta)}N(\boldsymbol{\eta}^s). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce the series in the definition of ξ_k^s is absolutely convergent, that $\boldsymbol{\xi}^s := (\xi_k^s) \in X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ and that

$$N(\boldsymbol{\xi}^s) \leqslant \frac{c}{1-\lambda(1+\delta)}N(\boldsymbol{\eta}^s). \tag{10}$$

Similarly one can show that $\boldsymbol{\xi}^u := (\xi^u_k)_k \in X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ and

$$N(\boldsymbol{\xi}^u) \leqslant \frac{c\lambda(1+\delta)}{1-\lambda(1+\delta)} N(\boldsymbol{\eta}^u). \tag{11}$$

The triangle inequality, (6), (10) and (11) now yield

$$N(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leqslant ac\frac{1+\lambda(1+\delta)}{1-\lambda(1+\delta)} N(\boldsymbol{\eta}). \tag{12}$$

It is easy to verify that $\Gamma_{o(x)}\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Also the constant on the right-hand side of (12) is the uniform bound on $N(\Gamma^{-1}_{o(x)})$. □

The following is a result from [9] adapted to our setting as in [8].

Proposition 2. *Assume $\Lambda \subseteq M$ is a closed, invariant set, such that for each $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible in X_∞ and $||\Gamma^{-1}_{o(x)}||_\infty$ is bounded uniformly for $x \in \Lambda$. Then Λ is uniformly hyperbolic.*

Proof. Assume c_1 is the uniform bound on $||\Gamma^{-1}_{o(x)}||_\infty$ and choose $x_0 \in \Lambda$. Choose any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d = T_{x_0}M$. Let $\eta_0 = \theta$ and $\eta_k = 0$ if $k \neq 0$. Clearly $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_k) \in X_\infty$. Since $\Gamma_{o(x_0)}$ is invertible, there exists $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in X_\infty$ such that $\Gamma_{o(x_0)}\boldsymbol{\xi} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. This can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_k &= Df(x_{k-1})\xi_{k-1},\ k \neq 0, \\ \xi_0 &= Df(x_{-1})\xi_{-1} + \theta. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We will now show that $\theta = \theta^s + \theta^u$, where $\theta^s = \xi_0$ and $\theta^u = -Df(x_{-1})\xi_{-1}$ is the hyperbolic splitting. We define a family of operators $B(z)$, $z \geqslant 1$ on X_∞ as

$$(B(z)\boldsymbol{\nu})_k = \begin{cases} \nu_k - (1/z)A_{k-1}\nu_{k-1},\ k \leq 0 \\ \nu_k - zA_{k-1}\nu_{k-1},\ k \geq 1. \end{cases}.$$

Note that $B(1) = \Gamma_{o(x_0)}$. Since Df is continuous and M is compact, let c_2 be the maximum of $|Df(x)|$ over M. Inequalities $||B(z) - B(1)||_\infty \leqslant c_2(z-1)$ and $||B(1)^{-1}||_\infty \leqslant c_1$ imply that $B(z)$ is an invertible operator for $1 \leqslant z < 1 + 1/(c_1c_2)$ and

$$||B(z)^{-1}||_\infty \leqslant \frac{1}{c_1^{-1} - c_2(z-1)}, \tag{14}$$

as $B(z)^{-1} = B(1)^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^\infty((B(1)-B(z))B(1)^{-1})^k$. Now choose any λ such that $1 < 1/\lambda < 1 + 1/(c_1c_2)$, and find a (unique) $\boldsymbol{\xi}^*$ such that $B(\lambda)\boldsymbol{\xi}^* = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. If c_3 is the right-hand side of (14) when $z = \lambda$, then

$$||\boldsymbol{\xi}^*||_\infty \leq ||B(\lambda)^{-1}||_\infty||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_\infty \leq c_3||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_\infty = c_3|\theta|.$$

As $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{**}$ defined as $\xi^{**}_k = \lambda^{|k|}\xi^*_k$ clearly belongs to X_∞ and by definition of $B(\lambda)$, $\Gamma_{o(x_0)}\boldsymbol{\xi}^{**} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$, it must be $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{**} = \boldsymbol{\xi}$, thus

$$|\xi_k| \leq c_3\lambda^{|k|}|\theta|. \tag{15}$$

Because of (13) and the definition of θ^s, θ^u, for all $k \geq 1$ it is

$$\xi_k = Df^k(x_0)\theta^s, \xi_{-k} = Df^{-k}(x_0)\theta^u. \tag{16}$$

Denote by $E^s(x_0)$, $E^u(x_0)$ the sets of all θ^s, θ^u constructed as above. The sets $E^s(x_0)$, $E^u(x_0)$ are linear subspaces, as images of linear maps

$$P^s = P^0 \circ \Gamma^{-1}_{o(x_0)} \circ J,\ P^u = I - P^s, \tag{17}$$

where $P^u, P^s : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $J : \mathbb{R}^d \to X_\infty$ is the inclusion $\theta \mapsto (..., 0, 0, \theta, 0, ..)$ and P^0 projection to the 0-coordinate. The construction implies that P^s, P^u are identities on $E^s(x_0)$, $E^u(x_0)$ respectively, therefore and because of $I = P^u + P^s$ we get $T_{x_0}M = E^s(x_0) \oplus E^u(x_0)$. Invariance of E^s, E^u with respect of Df follows from (17), and uniformly hyperbolic inequalities from (15), (16) by inserting $\theta = \theta^s$, $\theta = \theta^u$. □

The following Lemma gives further insight on the relationship of the graded norms $||.||_n$ and invertibility of $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. Let S denote the shift $(S\boldsymbol{\eta})_k = \eta_{k-1}$. Note that for any norm N with the property (3), S is a bounded linear operator with a continuous inverse on $X_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. Recall the definition of the norm and space X_n in (2). In the following we use results from the Appendix regarding matrix representation of operators on X_n, X_∞. In particular, if $\Gamma_{\mathbf{x}}$ is invertible with a continuous inverse, according to Lemma 11 its inverse has a matrix representation.

Lemma 1. *Assume* $\mathbf{x} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ *(not necessarily an orbit). Assume that for some constants* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $c_4 > 0$, *for all integers* k, $\Gamma_{S^k\boldsymbol{x}}$ *is invertible in* X_n *and* $||\Gamma^{-1}_{S^k\boldsymbol{x}}||_n \le c_4$. *Then* $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ *is invertible in* X_∞ *and*

$$||\Gamma^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{x}}||_\infty \le 2c_4 d\sqrt{d}/(1 - \exp(-1/n)).$$

Proof. Let Υ be the inverse of $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with the matrix representation $(\Upsilon_{i,j}), i, j \in \boldsymbol{Z}$, and $\Upsilon^{(k)}$ the inverse of $\Gamma_{S^k\boldsymbol{x}}$, all in X_n. As $\Gamma_{S^k\boldsymbol{x}} = S^{-k}\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}S^k$, and S is automorphism of X_n, we deduce that $\Upsilon^{(k)} = S^{-k}\Upsilon S^k$. Using that and (66), we obtain that for all $k \in \boldsymbol{Z}$,

$$\sup_i \sum_j \exp((|j| - |i|)/n)|\Upsilon_{i+k,j+k}|/(d\sqrt{d}) \le ||\Upsilon^{(k)}||_n \le c_4.$$

By choosing $i = 0$, $j = j_0 - i_0$, $k = i_0$, we deduce from it that for any i_0, j_0, $|\Upsilon_{i_0,j_0}| \le c_4 d\sqrt{d}\exp(-|j_0 - i_0|/n)$. We now get that

$$||\Upsilon||_\infty \le \sup_i \sum_j |\Upsilon_{i,j}| \le 2c_4 d\sqrt{d}/(1 - \exp(-1/n)).$$

□

Theorem 1 follows directly from Propositions 1, 2 and Lemma 1.

3. Nonuniform hyperbolicity

Prior to focusing on nonuniform hyperbolicity we will introduce a Fréchet space $\mathcal{N}$ which will be the key in the characterization of nonuniform hyperbolicity. Define $\mathcal{N}$ as the set of all sequences $\boldsymbol{\eta}=(\eta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $\eta_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfying

$$\limsup_k \frac{1}{|k|} \log |\eta_k| \le 0.$$

We can naturally equip $\mathcal{N}$ with the structure of a vector space. Also $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty X_n$, where X_n is as defined in the introduction, and the norms $||.||_n$ are graded in the sense that $||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_1 \le ||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_2 \le ||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_3 \le \ldots$. The topology on $\mathcal{N}$ is the topology generated by the family of norms $||.||_n$, $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$. Recall that a complete, locally convex topological vector space with a topology induced by a translation-invariant metric is called a Fréchet space ([12]).

Proposition 3. *$\mathcal{N}$ with the topology induced by the family of norms $||\cdot||_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ forms a Fréchet space.*

Proof. A countable family of norms always induces a locally convex topology which can be generated by a translation-invariant metric ([12]), so we only need to prove completeness of $\mathcal{N}$. Assume that $(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{N}$, so by definition it is Cauchy in X_n for all n, hence convergent to some $\boldsymbol{\xi}^n$. As the norms $||.||_n$ are graded, $\boldsymbol{\xi}^n =: \boldsymbol{\xi}$ is independent of n, so $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$ converge to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ in $\mathcal{N}$. $\square$

We noted in the introduction that $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is a well defined continuous linear operator on X_n for any positive integer n and any $\mathbf{x} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$, so $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is a well defined continuous linear operator on $\mathcal{N}$. It is also easy to check that $\Gamma_{o(x)} : X_n \to X_m$ is a well defined and continuous for any positive integers $n \geq m$.

Recall that an ergodic f-invariant Borel probability measure μ on M is hyperbolic if none of the Lyapunov exponents are zero. We now extend Theorem 2 and introduce several related characterizations of nonuniform hyperbolicity.

Theorem 4. *Say f is a diffeomorphism on M, and μ an ergodic f-invariant Borel probability measure. Then the following is equivalent:*

(i) The measure μ is hyperbolic.

(ii) For μ-a.e. $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is bijective on $\mathcal{N}$.

(iii) For μ-a.e. $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse on $\mathcal{N}$.

(iv) There exists a positive integer n_0 such that for any $n > n_0$, $n > m$, and for μ-a.e. $x \in M$ there exists a continuous operator $\Upsilon : X_n \to X_m$ which is a left and right inverse of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ in appropriate spaces.

(v) There exists increasing sequences of integers $n_i > m_i$ both converging to ∞ so that for μ-a.e. $x \in M$ there exist continuous operators $\Upsilon_i : X_{n_i} \to X_{m_i}$ which are left and right inverses of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ in appropriate spaces.

In the next section we further adapt this characterization to applications (see Corollary 2).

Recall that a point $x \in M$ is regularly hyperbolic, if there exists $0 < \lambda < 1$ and for each sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ a constant $c(x, \varepsilon)$ so that the following holds: there exists a decomposition $T_{x_k}M = E^s(x_k) \oplus E^u(x_k)$ along the orbit $x_k = f^k(x)$ with the invariance property $Df(x_k)E^u(x_k) = E^u(x_{k+1})$, $Df(x_k)E^s(x_k) = E^s(x_{k+1})$ and such that

$$\begin{aligned} |Df^j(x_k)\eta| &\leq c(x,\varepsilon)\lambda^j e^{\varepsilon|k|}|\eta| \text{ whenever } \eta \in E^s(x_k) \text{ and } j > 0, \text{ and} \\ |Df^{-j}(x_k)\eta| &\leq c(x,\varepsilon)\lambda^j e^{\varepsilon|k|}|\eta| \text{ whenever } \eta \in E^u(x_k) \text{ and } j > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the angle between $E^u(x_k)$ and $E^s(x_k)$ is bounded, so that if $\eta = \eta^s + \eta^u$ is the hyperbolic splitting at $T_{x_k}M$, then

$$|\eta^s| \leq c(x,\varepsilon)e^{\varepsilon|k|}|\eta|, \; |\eta^u| \leq c(x,\varepsilon)e^{\varepsilon|k|}|\eta|.$$

Pesin proved that if an ergodic f-invariant measure μ is hyperbolic, then μ-a.e. $x \in M$ is regularly hyperbolic and the function $c(x, \varepsilon)$ is Borel measurable for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ (see e.g. [2], Theorem 2.1.3).

We say that $x \in M$ is *u-hyperbolic*, if there exist two subspaces $E^u(x)$ and $E^s(x)$ spanning T_xM such that for all $\eta^u \in E^u \setminus \{0\}$, $\eta^s \in E^s \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log |Df^{-k}(x)\eta^s| &> 0, \\ \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log |Df^{k}(x)\eta^u| &> 0.\end{aligned}$$

We say that an ergodic f-invariant Borel probability measure μ on M is *u-hyperbolic* if $\mu-$a.e point is u-hyperbolic.

We prove Theorem 4 in a series of Lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Every u-hyperbolic measure is hyperbolic.*

Proof. Suppose that μ is an u-hyperbolic measure which is not hyperbolic. By Oseledec theorem there exists a Borel measurable set B with $\mu(B) = 1$ such that for all $x \in B$ there exists a splitting $T_xM = E^-(x) \oplus E^0(x) \oplus E^+(x)$ of subspaces with positive, zero and negative Lyapunov exponents respectively, and $\dim E^0(x) \geq 1$.

Let $B' \subseteq B$ be a set of full measure of u-hyperbolic points, and let $E^u(x)$, $E^s(x)$ be two subspaces spanning T_xM from the definition of u-hyperbolicity. Now by comparing the dimensions and discussing intersections of $E^-(x)$,$E^0(x)$, $E^+(x)$ and $E^u(x), E^s(x)$ it is easy to deduce contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Assume that $x \in M$ and that $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is an injective operator on $\mathcal{N}$. If $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_k)$ is a non-zero tangent orbit at $o(x)$, then either* $\limsup_{k\to\infty}(1/k)\log|\eta_k| > 0$ *or* $\limsup_{k\to\infty}(1/k)\log|\eta_{-k}| > 0$.

Proof. Assume the contrary and find such non-zero $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ which is then by assumption in $\mathcal{N}$. As $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a tangent orbit, so is $\Gamma_{o(x)}\boldsymbol{\eta} = 0$, which contradicts the injectivity of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$. $\square$

Lemma 4. *If $x \in M$ and $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is bijective on $\mathcal{N}$, then x is a u-hyperbolic point.*

Proof. Suppose $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is bijective on $\mathcal{N}$ and choose $\theta \in T_xM$. Define a $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\eta_0 = \theta$ and $\eta_k = 0$ for k non-zero. As $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is surjective, there exists $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\Gamma_{o(x)}\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\eta}$. If we put $\theta^s = \mu_0$ and $\theta^u = -Df(f^{-1}(x))\mu_{-1}$, then $\theta = \theta^s + \theta^u$. Now let $\mu_k^s := \mu_k$ for $k \geq 0$, and let

$$\mu_{-k}^s = Df^{-k}(x)\theta^s \tag{18}$$

for all $k \geqslant 1$. If θ^s is non-zero then one easily checks that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^s = (\mu_k^s)$ is a non-zero tangent orbit. As then $\Gamma_{o(x)}\boldsymbol{\mu}^s = 0$ and by construction $\limsup_{k\to\infty}(1/k)\log|\eta_k^s| \leq 0$, injectivity of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$, Lemma 3 and (18) imply that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}(1/k)\log|Df^{-k}(x)\theta^s| > 0.$$

Analogously we show that $\limsup_{k\to\infty}(1/k)\log|Df^{k}(x)\theta^u| > 0$ if $\theta^u \neq 0$.

If $E^s(x_0)$, $E^u(x_0)$ are the sets of all θ^s, θ^u constructed as above, we see that they are linear subspaces as images of linear maps as constructed in the proof of Proposition 2; spanning T_xM also by construction. $\square$

Suppose now that $x \in M$ is regularly hyperbolic. We now construct a left and right inverse of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ in appropriate spaces. Say $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in X_n$ for some positive integer

n. As in the proof of Proposition 1, we set

$$\eta_k^s = \sum_{l\geq 0} Df^l(x_{k-l})\mu_{k-l}^s, \tag{19}$$

$$\eta_k^u = -\sum_{l\geq 1} Df^{-l}(x_{k+l})\mu_{k+l}^u, \tag{20}$$

where $\mu_k = \mu_k^s + \mu_k^u$ is the hyperbolic splitting at $x_k = f^k(x)$.

We now use the definition of regular hyperbolicity and calculate for some positive integer m:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-|k|/m}|\eta_k^s| &\leq e^{-|k|/m}\sum_{l\geq 0} c(x,\varepsilon)\lambda^l e^{\varepsilon|k-l|}|\mu_{k-l}^s| \leq \\ &\leq e^{-|k|/m}\sum_{l\geq 0} c^2(x,\varepsilon)\lambda^l e^{2\varepsilon|k-l|}e^{|k-l|/n}e^{-|k-l|/n}|\mu_{k-l}| \leq \\ &\leq ||\mu||_n \cdot e^{(2\varepsilon+1/n-1/m)|k|}\cdot \sum_{l\geq 0} c^2(x,\varepsilon)e^{(2\varepsilon+1/n-\log(1/\lambda))|l|}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

If n is large enough such that $1/n - \log(1/\lambda) < 0$ and $n > m$, clearly we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that the expression in (21) multiplying $||\mu||_n$ is convergent and bounded uniformly in k (that means, the bound depends only on x, ε, n, m). We deduce that $\boldsymbol{\eta}^s \in X_m$, and also that the sum in (19) is absolutely convergent. Analogously $\boldsymbol{\eta}^u \in X_m$ and the sum in (20) is absolutely convergent. Noting the uniform bounds in (21) and its analogue for $\boldsymbol{\eta}^u$, we deduce that the operator $\Upsilon : \boldsymbol{\mu} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a continuous operator $\Upsilon : X_n \to X_m$. As both Υ and $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ are operators with a matrix representation (see Appendix for a discussion), it is easy to check that

$$\Upsilon \circ \Gamma_{o(x)} = \Gamma_{o(x)} \circ \Upsilon = I \tag{22}$$

where $\Gamma_{o(x)} : X_n \to X_n$, respectively $\Gamma_{o(x)} : X_m \to X_m$, and I is the identity operator. We summarize:

Lemma 5. *Assume that $x \in M$ is regularly hyperbolic with a coefficient $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then for any $n > 1/(\log(1/\lambda))$ and $n > m$, where n, m are positive integers, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a left and right continuous inverse $\Upsilon : X_n \to X_m$.*

Corollary 1. *Assume that $x \in M$ is a regularly hyperbolic point. Then $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse on $\mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. As X_n is a decreasing family of sets, the operator Υ constructed in Lemma 5 does not depend on n, m (this also follows from its construction). We deduce that it is well-defined and continuous on $\mathcal{N}$. The relation (22) restricted to $\mathcal{N}$ completes the proof. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 4.

Proof. Lemma 5 and the Pesin theorem imply (i)$\Longrightarrow$(iv). The implications (iv)$\Longrightarrow$(v) and (iii)$\Rightarrow$(ii) are trivial. If (v) is true, as X_n is a decreasing family of sets, it is easy to deduce that Υ_i is independent of i. Therefore $\Upsilon := \Upsilon_i$ is well defined and continuous on $\mathcal{N}$ and the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$, so (v)$\Longrightarrow$(iii). Combining Lemmas 2 and 4 we get (ii)$\Longrightarrow$(i). □

4. NONUNIFORM HYPERBOLICITY ON THE BOUNDARY OF ANOSOV DIFFEOMORPHISMS

As an example, we apply here the characterization of nonuniform hyperbolicity and give sufficient conditions for a map on the boundary of the set of Anosov diffeomorphisms to be (nonuniformly) hyperbolic.

Assume f_m is a sequence of Anosov diffeomorphisms on $M = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$. Let f be a diffeomorphism on M with an ergodic measure μ. Assume A_m is an increasing sequence of open sets, $A = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m$, and suppose A is f-invariant. We denote the uniform hyperbolic coefficients of f_m by c_m, λ_m (as in the definition) and a_m (the bound on the angle between E^u and E^s as in (5)).

We assume f_m converges to f in the following sense:

(i) The functions f_m and f coincide on A_m (hence also Df_m and Df coincide on A_m),

(ii) There is an uniform bound $b > 0$ on $|Df_m|$ for all m and on $|Df|$,

(iii) For all m, $\lambda_m \leq \lambda$ for some constant $\lambda < 1$,

(iv) $\mu(A) = 1$.

We can interpret these conditions as slowing down a uniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphism (or perturbing it in another way to destroy uniformity) on a set A^c of measure 0.

Theorem 5. *Assume f_m is a sequence of Anosov diffeomorphisms converging pointwise to f on the set A, satisfying all of the above. If*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mu(A_m^c)\log(a_m c_m) = 0,$$

then f is (nonuniformly) hyperbolic.

One can show that these conditions are satisfied, for example, in the case of Katok's construction [6] of a nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphism as a slowed down Arnold cat-map in a neighborhood of the fixed point 0.

Prior to proving the Theorem, we develop another tool based on the previous section for showing that a diffeomorphism is nonuniformly hyperbolic. Recall that for Banach spaces, a continuous linear operator Γ is invertible if there exist operators A, B and $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ such that $||I - A\Gamma|| \leq \lambda$, $||I - \Gamma B|| \leq \lambda$ (A, B are approximate left and right inverses of Γ; this was used for example in the proof of Proposition 2). We will need an analogue of this for Fréchet spaces:

Proposition 4. *Assume Γ is a continuous, linear operator on a Fréchet space $\mathcal{F}$. Assume there exists two families V_n, U_n, $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$, of neighborhoods of 0 such that $\{\delta U_n,\ n \in \boldsymbol{N},\ \delta > 0\}$ is a local base. If there exist families of continuous operators $A_{n,\delta}$, $B_{n,\delta}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ such that for all $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$, $\delta > 0$*

$$x \in V_n \Rightarrow (I - A_{n,\delta}\Gamma)x \in \delta U_n, \tag{23}$$

$$x \in V_n \Rightarrow (I - \Gamma B_{n,\delta})x \in \delta U_n, \tag{24}$$

then Γ is bijective with a continuous inverse.

Proof. Assume first Γ is not injective, and let $\Gamma y = 0$ for some $y \neq 0$. We can find $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ small enough so that $\varepsilon y \in V_1$ and $\varepsilon y \notin \delta U_n$, which contradicts (23). We now show the image of Γ is second-countable in $\mathcal{F}$, by showing that each open set in $\mathcal{F}$ contains uncountably many elements of $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$. Choose any $y \in \mathcal{F}$, find $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $\varepsilon y \in V_n$, and then by (24) $\Gamma(B_{n,\delta}(y)) \in y - \delta/\varepsilon U_n$. As $\{\delta U_n\}$ is a local base, each neighborhood of y contains an element $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{F})$. But then each neighborhood of y contains uncountably many elements of $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$ (i.e. z multiplied with a small open interval around 1).

As $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$ is second countable in $\mathcal{F}$, we apply the Open mapping theorem as stated in [12], Theorem 2.11, and deduce that $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ and that Γ is an open map. $\square$

Corollary 2. *Let f be a diffeomorphism on M and μ an ergodic f-invariant Borel probability measure. Assume that for μ-a.e. $x \in M$, there exist families of continuous operators $A_{n,\delta}$, $B_{n,\delta}$ on $\mathcal{N}$ so that for infinitely many positive integers n and all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,*

$$||I - A_{n,\delta}\Gamma_{o(x)}||_{2n,n} < \delta, \tag{25}$$

$$||I - \Gamma_{o(x)}B_{n,\delta}||_{2n,n} < \delta. \tag{26}$$

Then f is nonuniformly hyperbolic.

Proof. By applying Proposition 4 with V_n, U_n being the sets $||.||_{2n} < 1$, $||.||_n < 1$ respectively, we see that for μ-a.e. $x \in M$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible in $\mathcal{N}$ with a continuous inverse. It now suffices to apply Theorem 4. $\square$

We now construct a set $P \subseteq M$ of full measure so that, as we will see later, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible for $x \in P$. We rely for now only on ergodic-theoretical arguments and the fact that $A_m \nearrow A$, $\mu(A) = 1$.

Let P_ε, $\varepsilon > 0$, be the set of all $x \in M$ so that there are infinitely many indices $m_1 < m_2 < ... < m_i < ...$ and integers $j_i \geq \varepsilon/(1 - \mu(A_{m_i}))$ such that

$$f^{-j_i}(x) \in A_{m_i},\ f^{-j_i+1}(x) \in A_{m_i}, ..., f^{j_i}(x) \in A_{m_i}. \tag{27}$$

Lemma 6. *Assuming all of the above, $\mu(P_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon$.*

Proof. We set $P_{j,m}$ to be the set of all $x \in M$ so that $f^{-j}(x) \in A_m, ..., f^j(x) \in A_m$. By the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, for μ-a.e. $x \in M$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_{P_{j,m}}(f^i(x)) \to \mu(P_{j,m}) \tag{28}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Also by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, for μ-a.e. $x \in M$, any $\delta > 0$ and n large enough, $f(x), f^2(x), ..., f^n(x)$ is in A_m^c at most $n(1 - \mu(A_m) + \delta)$ times, hence for the same set $\mathbf{1}_{P_{j,m}}$ has value 0 at most

$$(2j + 1)n(1 - \mu(A_m) + \delta) + 2j \tag{29}$$

times (otherwise is 1). From (28), (29), and as $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary, we get

$$\mu(P_{j,m}) \geq 1 - (2j + 1)(1 - \mu(A_m)).$$

Without loss of generality assume m is large enough so that there is an odd integer $2j_m + 1$,

$$\frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \mu(A_m)} + 1 \leq 2j_m + 1 \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{1 - \mu(A_m)}.$$

We get then $\mu(P_{j_m,m}) \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon$ and $j_m \geq \varepsilon/(1 - \mu(A_m))$. It is a simple measure-theoretical argument to show that there is a measurable set P_ε, $\mu(P_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon$, so that each $x \in M$ is in infinitely many $P_{j_m,m}$. $\square$

We set $P = \bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} P_\varepsilon$. The set P can be interpreted as roughly the set of Birkhoff-regular points with respect to the increasing family of sets A_m. For example, in the case of Katok's perturbed cat-map [6], P is indeed the entire M with the exception of 0 and the stable and unstable manifolds of 0, as in Katok's construction.

We now complete the proof of Theorem 5.

Proof. Assume $x \in P_\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, where P_ε as above and by Lemma 6, $\mu(P_\varepsilon) \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon$. To show that $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible, we will apply Corollary 2. For that, we construct $A_{n,\delta}$, $B_{n,\delta}$ for given sufficiently large $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$ and sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ satisfying (25) and (26).

Assume m_i is a sequence of indices for which (27) holds, and

$$j_i \geq \varepsilon / (1 - \mu(A_{m_i})). \tag{30}$$

For now we will drop the subscript i (as it will be sufficient that m is large enough). Denote by $\Gamma = \Gamma_{o(x)}$, $\Gamma^{(m)} = \Gamma_{o(x)}$ the orbits with respect to respectively f, f_m. As f_m is uniformly hyperbolic, Proposition 1 implies that $\Gamma^{(m)}$ has an inverse $\Upsilon^{(m)}$ which is a well defined operator on X_n for all positive integers n, therefore also on $\mathcal{N}$. Choose n_0 large enough so that $\lambda \exp(1/n_0) < 1$. Then for any $n \geq n_0$ the relation (12) implies that

$$||\Upsilon^{(m)}||_{n,n} \leq a_m c_m \frac{1 + \lambda_m \exp(1/n)}{1 - \lambda_m \exp(1/n)} \leq \frac{4 a_m c_m}{1 - \lambda \exp(1/n_0)}, \tag{31}$$

As orbits and tangent orbits of x with respect to f and f_m coincide for iterations $-j, -j+1, ..., j$ for some j satisfying (30), by applying (67) from Appendix and (30) we get for $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} ||\Gamma - \Gamma^{(m)}||_{2n,n} &\leq \sup_{|k| \geq j+1} \exp\left(\frac{-|k+1|}{n} + \frac{|k|}{2n} \right) |Df_m(f_m^k(x)) - Df(f^k(x))| \leq \\ &\leq 2b \exp\left(\frac{-j+1}{2n} \right) \leq 2b \exp\left(\frac{-\varepsilon}{2n\mu(A_m^c)} + \frac{1}{2n_0} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We now look for sufficient conditions for

$$||\Upsilon^{(m)}||_{n,n} ||\Gamma - \Gamma^{(m)}||_{2n,n} < \delta, \tag{33}$$

$$||\Gamma - \Gamma^{(m)}||_{2n,n} ||\Upsilon^{(m)}||_{2n,2n} < \delta \tag{34}$$

to hold. Let c be the constant

$$c = \log 2b + \log \left(\frac{4}{1 - \lambda \exp(1/n_0)} \right) + \frac{1}{2n_0}.$$

Then from (31) and (32) one deduces that

$$\mu(A_m^c) \log a_m c_m + c\mu(A_m^c) + \mu(A_m^c) \log \frac{1}{\delta} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2n} \tag{35}$$

implies (33), (34). As $\mu(A_m^c) \log a_m c_m \to 0$ and $\mu(A_m^c) \to 0$, we can find sufficiently large $m = m(n, \delta, \varepsilon)$ such that (35) holds. From (33), (34) we deduce that $A_{n,\delta} = B_{n,\delta} := \Upsilon^{(m)}$ satisfies (25), (26), as required for Corollary 2 to hold. ☐

Perhaps the best explanation of the difference between uniform and nonuniform hyperbolicity in this context is the relation (32). Here we showed that the difference of two operators in the norm $||.||_{2n,n}$ can be very small if two orbits are only locally close. For uniform hyperbolicity and the norm $||.||_{n,n}$ to be small, orbits of two points would have to be uniformly close.

5. Shadowing Lemma

In this section we assume that f is a $C^{1+\alpha}$ diffeomorphism on M, $\alpha > 0$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{y} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a β-pseudoorbit if for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|f(y_{k-1}) - y_k| < \beta$. We now define precisely the notion of a shadowable invariant set and measure, used in the statement of Theorem 3.

We say that $\mathbf{x} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ ε-shadows $\mathbf{y} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$, if for all k, $|x_k - y_k| < \varepsilon$.

Definition 1. *We say that a set Λ is shadowable, if there exists an increasing sequence of sets Λ_k, $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Lambda_k = \Lambda$, and a number $\delta > 0$ depending on Λ_k, such that the following holds: For each $\rho > 0$ small enough there exists $\beta > 0$, $\beta = \beta(\rho, \Lambda_k, \delta)$, such that if $\boldsymbol{y} \in M^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a β-pseudoorbit, y_j in δ-neighborhood of Λ_k for all j then there exists $x \in M$ such that $o(x)$ ρ-shadows $\boldsymbol{y}$.*

An invariant measure is shadowable if there exists a shadowable set of full measure.

Uniformly hyperbolic sets are shadowable with $\Lambda_k = \Lambda$ ([7]). Katok proved that nonuniformly hyperbolic measures are shadowable ([7], Theorem S.4.14), where Λ_k are locally uniformly hyperbolic components of the Pesin set. Note that in the nonuniformly hyperbolic case, as well as in our more general setting, Λ_k are typically not invariant.

We now prove Theorem 3 in several steps. We fix now $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and the space X_n. Assume as in the statement of Theorem 3 that for each $x \in \Lambda$, $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ has a continuous inverse $\Upsilon_{o(x)}$ acting on X_n. Let Λ_m^* be the set of all $x \in \Lambda$ such that

$$||\Upsilon_{o(x)}||_n \leq m. \tag{36}$$

The following Proposition is the key in the proof of Theorem 3. In it we find δ small enough, construct the grading Λ_k and show that the operator $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is invertible in X_∞ for $\boldsymbol{y}$ being a δ-pseudoorbit close enough to Λ_k. More precisely:

Proposition 5. *Assume m, n are positive integers, and let Λ_m^* be as defined by (36). Then Λ_m^* can be decomposed into an increasing union of sets $\Lambda_m^* = \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} \Lambda_{m,r}$ such that the following holds: for any positive integer r there exists $\delta > 0$ (depending on m, r) such that if $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a δ-pseudoorbit, y_j in a δ-neighborhood of $\Lambda_{m,r}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ has a continuous inverse Θ in X_∞, such that*

$$||\Theta||_\infty \leq 4md^3/(1 - \exp(-1/n)). \tag{37}$$

We first outline the proof of Proposition 5. First we construct a countable decomposition of Λ_m^* into sets $\Lambda_{m,r}$ so that the inverses of operators Γ for two points in $\Lambda_{m,r}$ are close in some sense. Then we show in two steps that for δ small enough, $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ has an approximate left and an approximate right inverse, if $\mathbf{y}$ is a δ-pseudoorbit and y_j in a δ-neighborhood of $\Lambda_{m,r}$. From this we deduce that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ is invertible in both X_n and X_∞.

First note that for any $x \in M$ and any X_n, $1 \leq n \leq \infty$, the operator $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is bounded and quasi-diagonal in the sense that the diagonal elements are identity operators, and the only other non-vanishing elements in its matrix representation are on the lower diagonal (a precise definition is in the Appendix to the paper).

Let Υ be the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(x)}$. By Lemma 11 in the Appendix and the comment after the Lemma, Υ has a matrix representation $(\Upsilon_{i,j})$ (its elements $\Upsilon_{i,j}$ are linear operators on $\mathbb{R}^d$).

Lemma 7. *Let m, p be positive integers and $\varepsilon > 0$, and let Λ_m^* be as defined by (36). Then Λ_m^* can be decomposed into an increasing union of sets $\Lambda_m^* = \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} \Lambda_{m,r}$, such that if $z, \widetilde{z} \in \Lambda_{m,r}$, if $\Upsilon, \widetilde{\Upsilon}$ are the inverses of $\Gamma_{o(z)}, \Gamma_{o(\widetilde{z})}$ in X_n and $|z - \widetilde{z}| \leq 1/r$, then*

$$\sup_{|j| \leq p} |\Upsilon_{0,j} - \widetilde{\Upsilon}_{0,j}| < \varepsilon. \tag{38}$$

Proof. Assume $z_k \in \Lambda_m$ for all integers k. First note that if $z_k \to z$ as $k \to \infty$ in M, then $\Gamma_{o(z_k)}$ converges to $\Gamma_{o(z)}$ pointwise (i.e. for each matrix element i, j). Say $\Upsilon^{(k)}, \Upsilon$ are the inverses of $\Gamma_{o(z_k)}$,$\Gamma_{o(z)}$ in X_n. As $\Upsilon_{i,j}^{(k)}, \Upsilon_{i,j}$ are uniformly bounded for a given i, j (see (64) in the Appendix), $\Upsilon^{(k)}$ converges to Υ pointwise since the inverse of X_n is unique. Reasoning by contradiction, we find for each $z \in \Lambda_m$ a δ_z-neighborhood, $\delta_z > 0$ so that if $|z - \widetilde{z}| < \delta_z$, (38) holds. Now $\Lambda_{m,r}$ is the set of all $z \in \Lambda_m^*$ such that $\delta_z < 1/r$. □

We now introduce the notation and write explicitly the relations equivalent to invertibility in X_n. Choose any sequence $z_k \in \Lambda_m$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and denote by $\Upsilon^{(k)}$ the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(z_k)}$ in X_n, which then by definition satisfies

$$\Upsilon^{(k)} \Gamma_{o(z_k)} = \Gamma_{o(z_k)} \Upsilon^{(k)} = I, \tag{39}$$

$$||\Upsilon^{(k)}||_n \leq m. \tag{40}$$

If $(\Upsilon_{i,j}^{(k)})$, $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, is the matrix representation of $\Upsilon^{(k)}$ (which exists because of Lemma 11 in the Appendix), then (39) and the definition of $\Gamma_{o(z_k)}$ imply that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\Upsilon_{0,j-i}^{(i)} - \Upsilon_{0,j-i+1}^{(i)} Df(z_{i,j-i}) = \delta_{j-i} I, \tag{41}$$

$$-Df(z_{i-1,0}) \Upsilon_{0,j-i+1}^{(i-1)} + \Upsilon_{1,j-i+1}^{(i-1)} = \delta_{j-i} I. \tag{42}$$

where $z_{i,j} = f^j(z_i)$, δ_j is the Kronecker symbol $\delta_0 = 1$, $\delta_j = 0$ for $j \neq 0$, and I in (41), (41) is the identity operator on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore, (40) implies (using (66)) for rows $i = 0, 1$ that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp(|j|/n) |\Upsilon_{0,j}^{(i)}| \leq md\sqrt{d}, \tag{43}$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp(|j|/n) |\Upsilon_{1,j}^{(i)}| \leq m \exp(1/n) d\sqrt{d}. \tag{44}$$

Let c_1, c_2 be the constants related to the continuity and Hölder continuity of Df on M, i.e. such that for all $z_1, z_2 \in M$,

$$|Df(z_1)| \leq c_1, \tag{45}$$

$$|Df(z_1) - Df(z_2)| \leq c_2 |z_1 - z_2|^{\alpha}. \tag{46}$$

Lemma 8. *Assume m is an integer and Λ_m^* as defined by (36). Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a δ-pseudoorbit, y_j in a δ-neighborhood of Λ_m^*, then $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ has an approximate left inverse $\tilde{\Theta}$ in X_n, that means a continuous operator $\tilde{\Theta}$ such that $||\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}} - I||_n \leq 1/2$. Furthermore, $||\tilde{\Theta}||_n \leq md\sqrt{d}$.*

Proof. Let $z_i \in \Lambda_m^*$ such that $|z_i - y_i| < \delta$ and let $\Upsilon^{(i)}$ be the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(z_i)}$ in X_n. We define

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{i,j} = \lambda^{|j-i|} \Upsilon_{0,j-i}^{(i)} \tag{47}$$

for some $0<\lambda<1$ to be defined later. We denote by $\Delta=\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}-I$, and then by definition of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ and since $\delta_{j-i}=\lambda^{|j-i|}\delta_{j-i}$,

$$\Delta_{i,j}=\tilde{\Theta}_{i,j}-\tilde{\Theta}_{i,j+1}Df(y_j)-\lambda^{|j-i|}\delta_{j-i}I.$$

Substituting $\delta_{j-i}I$ with (41), applying (47) and then (45) and (46) we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta_{i,j}| &= |\lambda^{|j-i|}\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}Df(z_{i,j-i})-\lambda^{|j-i+1|}\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}Df(y_j)|\leq\\ &\leq \lambda^{|j-i|}|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|\cdot\min\{2c_1,c_2|z_{i,j-i}-y_j|^{\alpha}\}+\\ &\quad+\lambda^{|j-i|}(1-\lambda)\cdot c_1|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|.\end{aligned}$$

For some integer q also to be defined later, we can rewrite that as

$$|\Delta_{i,j}|\leq\begin{cases}|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|\,(2c_1\lambda^q+c_1(1-\lambda)) & |j-i|\geq q\\ |\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|\,(c_2d(q)+c_1(1-\lambda)) & |j-i|<q,\end{cases}\tag{48}$$

where

$$d(q)=\sup_{|j-i|<q}|z_{i,j-i}-y_j|^{\alpha}.$$

Now we bound $||\Delta||_n$ using (65). From (43) and (48) we get that for all i,

$$\exp(-|i|/n)\sum_j\exp(|j|/n)|\Delta_{i,j}|\leq\lambda^q2c_1c_3+c_1(1-\lambda)c_3+c_2d(q)c_3,\tag{49}$$

where $c_3=\exp(1/n)md\sqrt{d}$. We can now choose $0<\lambda<1$ (depending only on c_1,n,m) so that the second summand in (49) is $\leq 1/8$, and an integer q large enough (also depending only on c_1,n,m) so that the first summand is $\leq 1/8$. We can also find $\delta>0$ small enough (depending only on c_2,n,m,α) so that $d(q)$ is small enough and that the third summand is also $\leq 1/8$, hence $||\Delta||_n\leq 3/8<1/2$.

The relation

$$||\tilde{\Theta}||_n\leq md\sqrt{d}.$$

follows directly from (40), (47), (65) and (66). □

In the following Lemma we again use the notation $\tilde{\Theta}$, λ and δ. They are not necessarily the same as in the statement and the proof of Lemma 8, but the notation is kept for simplicity.

Lemma 9. *Assume m is an integer. Then there exists $p\in\boldsymbol{N}$ such that for each $r\in\boldsymbol{N}$, if $\Lambda_{m,r}$ is as constructed in Lemma 7 then the following holds: there exists $\delta>0$, such that if $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a δ-pseudoorbit, y_j in a δ-neighborhood of $\Lambda_{m,r}$, then $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ has an approximate right inverse $\tilde{\Theta}$ in X_n, that means a continuous operator $\tilde{\Theta}$ such that $||\Gamma_y\tilde{\Theta}-I||_n\leq 1/2$. Furthermore, $||\tilde{\Theta}||_n\leq md\sqrt{d}$.*

Proof. Assume $z_i\in\Lambda^*_m$ such that $|z_i-y_i|<\delta$ and let $\Upsilon^{(i)}$ be the inverse of $\Gamma_{o(z_i)}$ in X_n. Let

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{i,j}=\lambda^{|j-i|}\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i}\tag{50}$$

for some $0<\lambda<1$ to be defined later, and let $\widetilde{\Delta}=\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}\tilde{\Theta}-I$. Then

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_{i,j}=-Df(y_{i-1})\tilde{\Theta}_{i-1,j}+\tilde{\Theta}_{i,j}-\lambda^{|j-i|}\delta_{j-i}I.$$

Similarly as in Lemma 8, using (50), (42) and then (45) and (46), we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\widetilde{\Delta}_{i,j}| &\leq \lambda^{|j-i|}|\Upsilon^{(i-1)}_{0,j-i+1}|\cdot\min\{2c_1, c_2|z_{i-1}-y_{i-1}|^{\alpha}\}+\\ &\quad +\lambda^{|j-i|}(1-\lambda)\cdot c_1|\Upsilon^{(i-1)}_{0,j-i+1}|+\lambda^{|j-i|}|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i}-\Upsilon^{(i-1)}_{1,j-i+1}|.\end{aligned}$$

For some positive integer p to be chosen later, we deduce that
(51)

$$|\widetilde{\Delta}_{i,j}| \leq \begin{cases} |\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|\,(2c_1\lambda^p+c_1(1-\lambda))+\lambda^p|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i}|+\lambda^p|\Upsilon^{(i-1)}_{1,j-i+1}| & |j-i|\geq p\\ |\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i+1}|\,(c_2|z_{i-1}-y_{i-1}|^{\alpha}+c_1(1-\lambda))+e(p) & |j-i|<p,\end{cases}$$

where

$$e(p)=\sup_{|j-i|\leq p}|\Upsilon^{(i)}_{0,j-i}-\Upsilon^{(i-1)}_{1,j-i+1}|.$$

From (43), (44) and (51) we get that for all i,

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(-|i|/n)\sum_j \exp(|j|/n)|\widetilde{\Delta}_{i,j}| &\leq \lambda^p 2c_1c_3+\lambda^p 2m+c_1(1-\lambda)c_3+\\ &\quad +c_2\sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}|z_{i-1}-y_{i-1}|^{\alpha}c_3+c_4(p)e(p),\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

where $c_3=\exp(1/n)md\sqrt{d}$, $c_4(p)=\sum_{|j|<p}\exp(|j|/n)$.

Again $0<\lambda<1$ is chosen so that the third summand in (52) is $\leq 1/8$. We choose p large enough so that the sum of the first two summands is $\leq 1/8$, and we choose δ_1 small enough so that if y_i is δ_1-close to z_i for all integers i, the fourth summand is $\leq 1/8$.

We now set $\varepsilon=1/8c_4(p)$, and apply Lemma 7 and find for the chosen p an increasing decomposition $\Lambda_m=\bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty}\Lambda_{m,r}$. Let $\Upsilon=\Upsilon^{(i)}$, $\widetilde{\Upsilon}=S^{-1}\Upsilon^{(i-1)}S$, $z=z_i$ and $\tilde{z}=f(z_{i-1})$ for any integer i. Then $e(p)$ is equal to the left-hand side of (38). Now there exists $\delta\leq\delta_1$ such that if $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a δ-pseudoorbit, $|y_i-z_i|<\delta$ for all integers i, then $|z-\tilde{z}|<1/r$ and $z,\tilde{z}\in\Lambda_{m,r}$, hence $e(p)<\varepsilon$ and the fourth summand is $\leq 1/8$. From (65) we deduce that $||\widetilde{\Delta}||_n\leq 1/2$.

The bound on $||\tilde{\Theta}||_n$ is obtained as in Lemma 8. □

We now complete the proof of Proposition 5.

Proof. Let $\Lambda_{m,r}$ be the sets constructed in Lemma 9, and let $\delta>0$ be the smaller of the δ's constructed in Lemmas 8, 9 for given positive integers m,r. We first show that for that δ, if $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the conditions of the Proposition, than $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ has a continuous inverse in X_n. Let $\tilde{\Theta}$ be the approximate left inverse constructed in Lemma 8. As $||\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_y-I||_n\leq 1/2$, $\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_y$ has the inverse

$$(\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}})^{-1}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(I-\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_y)^k,$$

as the series is absolutely convergent in X_n. We deduce that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ has the left inverse $\Theta=(\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}})^{-1}\tilde{\Theta}$ in X_n, with the norm

$$||\Theta||_n\leq||(\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}})^{-1}||_n||\tilde{\Theta}||_n\leq\frac{1}{1-||\tilde{\Theta}\Gamma_y-I||_n}\cdot md\sqrt{d}\leq 2md\sqrt{d}.$$

Similarly we show that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ has a bounded right inverse, hence Θ must be the inverse of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ in X_n. We finally show that $\Theta\in X_{\infty}$. This and (37) follow directly from Lemma 1. □

We now prove Theorem 3 by constructing a contraction mapping on X_∞.

Proof. By Proposition 5, there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $K > 0$ such that for every δ-pseudoorbit $\boldsymbol{y}$, y_k in δ-neighborhood of $\Lambda_{m,r}$ for all k, operator $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is invertible on X_∞ and $||\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}^{-1}||_\infty \leqslant K$. We define maps $A_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ and $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ on X_∞ as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})_n &= f(y_{n-1}+\xi_{n-1}) - y_n, \\ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \boldsymbol{\xi} + \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}^{-1}(A_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - \boldsymbol{\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to show that $A_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is differentiable on a neighborhood of 0 in X_∞. The derivative of $A_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ at $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is the linear operator on X_∞ given by

$$(DA_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})\boldsymbol{\eta})_n = Df(y_{n-1}+\xi_{n-1})\eta_{n-1}.$$

Take any $0 < \kappa < 1$. Since Df is continuous and $DA_{\boldsymbol{y}}(0) = I - \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}$, for any $\rho > 0$ small enough (smaller than some ρ_0), if $||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho$ then

$$||DA_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - (I - \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}})||_\infty \leqslant \frac{\kappa}{K}. \tag{53}$$

We now choose $\beta = \beta(\rho, \Lambda_{m,r}, \delta)$, $\beta \leq \delta$ so that

$$K\beta \leqslant (1-\kappa)\rho \tag{54}$$

and assume that $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a β-pseudoorbit, or equivalently

$$||A_{\boldsymbol{y}}(0)||_\infty \leq \beta. \tag{55}$$

For any $||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho$ the map $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is differentiable at $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} D\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= I + \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}^{-1}(DA_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - I) \\ &= \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}}^{-1}(DA_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - (I - \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{y}})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for each $||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho$,

$$||D\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})||_\infty \leqslant \kappa < 1. \tag{56}$$

Now let $||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho$. Then by applying (56), (55) and finally (54) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} ||\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})||_\infty &\leqslant ||\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - \Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(0)||_\infty + ||\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}(0)||_\infty \\ &\leqslant \kappa\rho + K\beta \\ &\leqslant \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved that $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is a contraction on $\{||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho\}$ and therefore has a unique fixed point in $\{||\boldsymbol{\xi}||_\infty \leqslant \rho\}$. Since $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ has the same fixed points as $A_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ and since the fixed points of $A_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ are exactly the orbits of f, we have proved that for $\Lambda_{m,r}$ we can find the required $\beta = \beta(\rho, \Lambda_{m,r}, \delta)$ as in the definition of shadowable set. We now set $\Lambda_k = \cup_{m,r\leq k}\Lambda_{m,r}$ and $\beta(\rho, \Lambda_k, \delta) = \min_{m,r\leq k} \beta(\rho, \Lambda_{m,r}, \delta)$ which completes the proof. □

One can further strengthen Theorem 3 and replace the condition that $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ is invertible in X_n with $\Gamma_{o(x)}$ having left and right inverses $\Upsilon : X_{n_1} \to X_{n_2}$ for some $n_1 \geq n_2$ (the proof is essentially analogous but with more complex notation). By Theorem 4, the Shadowing lemma for nonuniformly hyperbolic measures as established by Katok [7] now follows as a corollary, while other formulations in the nonuniformly hyperbolic case ([5], [11]) can be established by further modifying the proof of Theorem 3.

6. Appendix: norms of operators on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

Here we summarize several technical results on the operators on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the convenience of the reader. We say a bounded linear operator on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a matrix representation, if there exist a family of linear operators $A_{i,j} \in L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that for each $\boldsymbol{x} \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$(A\mathbf{x})_i = \sum_j A_{i,j} x_j,$$

where the series above absolutely converges for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We note that one can construct bounded linear operators on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which have no matrix representation. (Example for $d = 1$: such an operator is $A\mathbf{x} = l(\mathbf{x})\iota$, where $\iota \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\iota_j = 1$ for all j, and $l(\mathbf{x})$ is any continuous linear functional defined so that $l(c \cdot \iota) = c$ for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $l(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}$ with only finitely many non-zeros, and extended by the Hahn-Banach theorem to the entire $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. See e.g. [12], Section 6, for a more general discussion.)

Assume a bounded linear operator A on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has the matrix representation $A_{i,j} \in L(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then by triangle inequality,

$$||A||_\infty \leq \sup_i \sum_j |A_{i,j}|. \tag{57}$$

We say that an operator A on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is quasi-diagonal, if there exist linear operators $A_i \in L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that

$$(A\boldsymbol{x})_i = -A_{i-1} x_{i-1} + x_i, \tag{58}$$

hence a quasi-diagonal operator on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is bounded if and only if $|A_i|$ are bounded uniformly in i.

One can prove by choosing appropriate $\boldsymbol{x} \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that there is equality in (57) if $d = 1$. More generally, we can deduce the following:

Lemma 10. *Say a bounded linear operator A on $l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has matrix representation $A_{i,j}$. Then*

$$||A||_\infty \geq \frac{1}{d\sqrt{d}} \sup_i \sum_j |A_{i,j}|. \tag{59}$$

Proof. Say $y_1, ..., y_d$ is the orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then it is easy to show that for each vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there is some $1 \leq k \leq d$ such that $|(x, y_k)| \geq |x|/\sqrt{d}$. Fix $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and find vectors $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|z_j| = 1$ such that $|A_{i,j} z_j| = |A_{i,j}|$. We can now construct a partition of $\mathbb{Z} = V_1 \cup ... \cup V_d$ such that for each $j \in V_k$, $|(A_{i,j} z_j, y_k)| \geq |A_{i,j}|/\sqrt{d}$. Without loss of generality we can choose the sign of z_j so that for each $j \in V_k$,

$$(A_{i,j} z_j, y_k) \geq |A_{i,j}|/\sqrt{d}.$$

Now for non-empty V_k we define $\boldsymbol{x} \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $x_j = z_j$ for $j \in V_k$, $x_j = 0$ otherwise (and then $||\boldsymbol{x}||_\infty = 1$). We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} ||A||_\infty &\geq |(A\boldsymbol{x})_i| = \left| \sum_{j \in V_k} A_{i,j} z_j \right| \geq \left| \sum_{j \in V_k} (A_{i,j} z_j, y_k) \right| = \\ &= \sum_{j \in V_k} (A_{i,j} z_j, y_k) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j \in V_k} |A_{i,j}|. \end{aligned}$$

We get the claim by summing that over all $k = 1, ..., d$. $\square$

In cases interesting in this paper, one can show that the inverse of an operator with a matrix representation also has a matrix representation:

Lemma 11. *Assume A is a bounded quasi-diagonal operator on $l_\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^d)$ represented with (58) and with a bounded inverse B. Then B has a matrix representation $B_{i,j}$ such that*

$$|B_{i,j}| \leq c\lambda^{|j-i|}, \tag{60}$$

where $c = a\lambda/(\lambda - ab(1-\lambda))$, $a = \sup_i |A_i|$, $b = ||B||_\infty$ and λ any real number such that $ab/(ab+1) < \lambda < 1$.

Proof. We fix $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ for now and choose any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We define $\boldsymbol{y}$ as $y_j = \theta$, $y_k = 0$ for $k \neq j$ and let $\boldsymbol{w} = B\boldsymbol{y}$, thus $\boldsymbol{y} = A\boldsymbol{w}$. We define linear operators $B_{i,j}$ with $B_{i,j}(\theta) = w_i$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and w_i defined as above. As B is linear and $B\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{w}$, so is $B_{i,j}$.

We now perturb linear operators A around the j-th index, and define a linear operator $A(z)$ for a real parameter $z \geq 1$ with

$$(A(z)\boldsymbol{x})_i = \begin{cases} -(1/z)A_{i-1}x_{i-1} + x_i, \ i \leq j \\ -zA_{i-1}x_{i-1} + x_i, \ i \geq j+1. \end{cases}$$

Now clearly $A(1) = A$ and $||A(z) - A||_\infty \leq a(z-1)$. As $||A^{-1}||_\infty = b$, $A(z)$ is invertible for $z < 1 + 1/ab$ and

$$||A(z)^{-1}|| \leq 1/(a^{-1} - b(z-1)). \tag{61}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{w}^* = A(z)^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}$. Then (61) and the definition of $\boldsymbol{y}$ imply that

$$|w_i^*| \leq |\theta|/(a^{-1} - b(z-1)).$$

However it is easy to deduce from the definitions of $A(z), A$ (as in the proof of Proposition 2) that $w_i^* = z^{|i-j|}w_i$, thus

$$|w_i| \leq |\theta| z^{-|i-j|}/(a^{-1} - b(z-1)). \tag{62}$$

By setting $\lambda = 1/z$ one gets the required bound on $|B_{i,j}|$ from the right-hand side of (62) and the definition of $B_{i,j}$.

If we now define an operator B^* with $(B^*\boldsymbol{x})_i = \sum_j B_{i,j}x_j$, then the series converges absolutely for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in l_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By calculating one checks that B^* is the inverse of A, so $B^* = B$ and $(B_{i,j})$ is its matrix representation. $\square$

Now say X_n are the Banach spaces defined in the introduction with the norm $||\boldsymbol{x}||_n = \sup_k \exp(-|k|/n)|x_k|$. By a simple isomorphism argument one gets that all the results above hold if we replace $A_{i,j}$ with

$$\exp((|j| - |i|)/n)A_{i,j}. \tag{63}$$

In particular (60) in X_n becomes

$$|B_{i,j}| \leq c\lambda^{|j-i|}\exp((|i| - |j|)/n). \tag{64}$$

Furthermore, if A is a linear operator on X_n with the matrix representation $A_{i,j} \in L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then (57) and (59) imply that

$$||A||_n \leq \sup_i \exp(-|i|/n) \sum_j \exp(|j|/n)|A_{i,j}| \tag{65}$$

and for all integers i,

$$\exp(-|i|/n)\sum_j \exp(|j|/n)|A_{i,j}| \le ||A||_n d\sqrt{d}. \tag{66}$$

Similarly, if A is a linear operator $A : X_n \to X_m$, then its norm (denoted by $||.||_{n,m}$) can be bounded with

$$||A||_{n,m} \le \sup_i \exp(-|i|/m)\sum_j \exp(|j|/n)|A_{i,j}|. \tag{67}$$

References

[1] L. Barreira and Y. Pesin, *Nonuniform Hyperbolicity*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[2] L. Barreira and Y. Pesin, *Lyapunov Exponents and Smooth Ergodic Theory*, American Mathematical Society, 2002.

[3] C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz and M. Vianna, *Dynamics Beyond Uniform Hyperbolicity*, Springer, 2005.

[4] B. Hasselblatt, *Hyperbolic dynamical systems*, in B. Hassellblatt, A. Katok (ed.), *Handbook of Dynamical Systems Vol 1A*, Elsevier (2002), 230-320.

[5] M. Hirayama, *Periodic probability measures are dense in the set of invariant measures*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 9 (2003), 1185-1192.

[6] A. Katok, *Bernoulli Diffeomorphisms on Surfaces*, Annals of Mathematics 110 (1979), 529-547.

[7] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[8] O. E. Lanford, *Introduction to hyperbolic sets*, in: Regular and Chaotic Motions in Dynamical Systems, eds. G. Velo and A. S. Wightman, NATO ASI Ser B Vol. 18, Plenum (1985), 73-102.

[9] J. Mather, *Characterization of Anosov diffeomorphisms,* Indag. Math., 30 (1968), 479-483.

[10] R. S. Mackay, *Dynamical systems, Notes of a Part III course*, unpublished, University of Cambridge (1997).

[11] M. Pollicott, *Lectures on Ergodic Theory and Pesin Theory on Compact Manifolds*, LNS 180, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[12] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1991.

[13] D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C 5 (1992), 77-81.

Department of Mathematics, University of Zagreb, Bijenicka 30, Zagreb, Croatia
E-mail address: `ddragicevic@math.uniri.hr, slijepce@math.hr`